DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 179 262 JC 790 615

AUTHOR Steinmetz, Amber, Ed.
TITLE American Mathematical Association of Two-Year Colleges Developmental Mathematics Curriculum Committee: Annual Report.
INSTITUTION American Mathematical Association of Two-Year Colleges.
PUB DATE Oct 79
NOTE 23p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Basic Skills; College Mathematics; Community Colleges; Curriculum Development; Electromechanical Aids; Item Analysis; *Junior Colleges; *Mathematics Education; *Mathematics Teachers; Minimum Competency Testing; Program Evaluation; *Remedial Mathematics; Remedial Teachers; Teacher Education; Teacher Qualifications
IDENTIFIERS *Hand Held Calculators

ABSTRACT

A review of objectives for the current five-year plan (1977-1982) and an annual report outlining progress made during 1979 are presented for each sub-committee of the Developmental Mathematics Curriculum Committee (DMCC) of the American Mathematical Association of Two-Year Colleges (AMATYC). The sub-committee for hand-held calculators outlines a 1979 study in which two developmental mathematics (DM) classes at Utah Technical College--one with calculators and the other without--demonstrated no significant difference in grade level increase. The sub-committee on testing reports the availability of 800 questions gathered from colleges nationwide and solicits member participation in testing these questions in the classroom. The sub-committee on teacher qualifications reports the continuing, though incomplete, efforts to arrange debates on the necessary qualifications of DM teachers. The sub-committee for liaison reports the failure of its efforts to locate local organizations with interests similar to those of the DMCC. The evaluation model sub-committee, developing a guide for DM evaluation, outlines progress to date on the development of student testing and student, faculty, and administrator evaluation. The sub-committee for a DMCC newsletter reports the establishment of the "Two-Year College Math Review," to be published independently of the AMATYC Journal. A report for the sub-committee on minimal competencies was not submitted, though its accomplishments through 1978 are listed. (JP)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED179262

AMERICAN MATHEMATICAL ASSOCIATION OF TWO-YEAR COLLEGES

DEVELOPMENTAL MATHEMATICS CURRICULUM COMMITTEE

ANNUAL REPORT

OCTOBER, 1979

Amber Steinmetz, Chairperson
Three Rivers Community College
Poplar Bluff, Missouri 63901

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Alice Berridge

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

JC 790 615

INTRODUCTION

The Developmental Mathematics Curriculum Committee was one of the first standing committees of the AMERICAN MATHEMATICAL ASSOCIATION OF TWO-YEAR COLLEGES (AMATYC). Organized in 1974, the committee is comprised of those members of AMATYC interested in the topic of developmental mathematics. Developmental mathematics has been roughly defined as remedial mathematics. This includes arithmetic topics, basics of algebra and some elementary geometry.

The annual report for 1978, on file with ERIC, Clearing House for Junior Colleges, listed the five-year plan of the committee (1977-1982) as well as the committee's broad objectives. This year, in addition to reviewing the work accomplished in committee during 1979, the objectives for each sub-committee will be reviewed.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

SUB-COMMITTEE REPORTS:

Hand Held Calculators.....Lowell Salmond
Utah Technical College
Salt Lake City, Utah

Testing.....Ann Dice
Harper College
Palatine, Illinois

Teacher Qualifications.....Patricia Dyer
Broward Community College
Pompano Beach, Florida

Minimal Competency.....William Drezdzon
Oakton Community College
Morton Grove, Illinois

Liaison.....Karen Sharp
C. S. Mott Community College
Flint, Michigan

Evaluation Model.....Matt Hassett
Arizona State University
Tempe, Arizona

DMC Newsletter.....Alice Berridge
Nassau Community College
Garden City, New York

CONCLUSIONS

HAND-HELD CALCULATORS

The five-year goal of this committee is to establish a recommended procedure for the use of hand-held calculators in DMC classes. Objectives were listed as:

1. Determine the present policy in DMC two-year college classes on hand-held calculators.
2. Set up debates on the wisest use of hand-held calculators.
3. Survey other organizations to determine attitudes toward calculators.
4. Perform some experimentation into the benefits and faults of using calculators.
5. Establish and publicize an AMATYC policy for the use of calculators in DMC classes.

During 1978 a questionnaire* distributed to instructors interested in the work of DMC furnished the following data:

1. Use of calculator should be taught in conjunction with a specific learning experience.
2. Desire of student to learn basic concepts is not hindered by the calculator.
3. Most schools do not furnish calculators for students.
4. No particular calculator was deemed superior.
5. Most schools have no policy relating to the calculator.
6. Restrictions were not usually made on activity (homework, checking, tests, etc.) where calculators might be used.

Two questions on the questionnaire furnished information for a formal study in the future years: How does the hand-held calculator affect the student's interest in math? Does the computational skill of the student change with the use of the calculator? The last question was handled in committee this year.

When this committee completes its experiments dealing with the benefits and faults of using calculators in the classroom, it should be in a position to establish an AMATYC policy for the use of calculators in DMC classes. In so doing, it will have completed its objectives as listed above.

•

Questionnaire and results are filed with ERIC, Junior College Clearing House.

STUDY ON THE EFFECTS OF STUDENTS USING A CALCULATOR TO LEARN BASIC MATHEMATICS

by

Lowell Salmond, Tom Matthews, Jerry Giles
Utah Technical College
Salt Lake City, Utah

THE HYPOTHESIS

The purpose of this study was to determine that there would be no significant difference in grade level increase between those students who are taught basic mathematics using a traditional individualized approach and those who were taught with the same approach, but were allowed to use a calculator to work their problems.

THE STUDY

The students in the Pre-Tech Department at Utah Technical College at Salt Lake were divided into two groups during the summer quarter, 1979. The first group was taught in the usual individualized manner and was tested with both pre- and post-tests. The second group was given the same kind of instruction, but they were allowed to use calculators to work out the answers to the problems. This second group was given pre-tests and post-tests, using the same tests. Students from the calculator group were matched on the basis of the pre-test scores with students from the control group.

The tests used to match the students were the Wide Range Achievement Test for Arithmetic and the placement test made up by the Pre-Tech Department. Students were matched exactly with the WRAT test and the placement test was used only to differentiate between students who had identical WRAT scores. Neither group of students was allowed to use the calculator on the pre- or post-tests.

THE RESULTS

The Data Table at the end of this study shows the results of the study student by student. It also contains the means, standard deviations, Pearson r, and t-test for significance of differences between means.

The correlation between the post WRAT test scores was significant with two degrees of freedom to the.05 level at .443. The t-test was also significant to the .05 level with two degrees of freedom at 2.19.

As a result of the study, the hypothesis must be rejected that there is no significant difference in grade level increase between those who use a calculator to learn basic mathematics and those who do not.

RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that a further study be made nationally to verify the findings of this study. There seems to be reason to believe that a student who uses a calculator to learn basic math does better on the Wide Range Achievement Test for Arithmetic than students who learn using pencil and paper only.

DATA TABLE

STUDENT NUMBER	CONTROL GROUP PRE	POST	STUDENT NUMBER	CALCULATOR GROUP PRE	POST	POST-TEST STATISTICS
1	8.5	11.3	1A	8.5	12.3	Control Mean
2	12.3	13.3	2A	12.3	13.3	10.40
3	7.7	10.8	3A	7.7	9.5	Control S. D.
4	6.5	7.4	4A	6.5	12.3	2.30
5	6.3	7.4	5A	6.3	9.0	Calculator Mean
6	7.7	10.1	6A	7.7	8.0	11.33
7	12.3	13.3	7A	12.3	12.8	Calculator S. D.
8	11.3	12.8	8A	11.3	12.1	2.34
9	7.4	7.5	9A	7.4	8.2	Pearson r
10	6.9	9.5	10A	6.9	12.3	.443
11	7.4	11.8	11A	7.4	18.3	Significance Level
12	4.9	6.3	12A	4.9	9.5	.05
13	9.5	12.8	13A	9.5	13.3	t-Test
14	8.0	12.8	14A	8.0	12.3	2.19
15	7.4	13.3	15A	7.4	12.8	Significance Level
16	9.0	11.8	16A	9.0	11.3	.05
17	6.7	11.3	17A	6.7	7.7	
18	6.5	11.8	18A	6.5	10.8	
19	3.9	5.3	19A	3.9	11.8	
20	9.3	12.8	20A	9.3	11.3	
21	8.5	11.3	21A	8.5	11.3	
22	8.5	10.1	22A	8.5	10.8	
23	6.7	9.5	23A	6.7	8.5	
24	8.0	12.8	24A	8.0	11.3	
25	8.5	10.1	25A	8.5	12.8	
26	9.5	12.8	26A	9.5	14.9	
27	6.9	9.5	27A	6.9	10.1	
28	6.9	10.1	28A	6.9	13.8	
29	6.9	9.0	29A	6.9	13.3	
30	6.5	7.4	30A	6.5	11.3	
31	4.9	6.3	31A	4.9	7.1	
32	6.9	9.5	32A	6.9	8.0	
33	8.5	11.3	33A	8.5	11.8	

TESTING

The five-year goal of this committee is to develop an item pool of reliable test questions to be used by AMATYC member institutions for evaluation. Objectives were listed as:

1. Gather placement tests from colleges in USA.
2. Perform content analysis of tests to determine in general the usual areas of concern.
3. Develop alternate responses to test questions that are not in multiple-choice form.
4. Develop item analysis procedures to determine if the alternate choices are suitable.
5. Develop workshops with consultants on placement test construction.
6. Check reliability and validity of a selected sample of placement tests.

During the past two years, the first three objectives were completed with a booklet of categorized test questions being made available at the convention in Atlanta and Houston to those members of AMATYC present. Other persons ordered their sets of test questions from the chairperson of the DMC committee.

The demand for these questions was greater than anticipated, so a new goal was established to replace the set of questions. This was handled in committee this year.

The objectives of this committee that have not been met, have been considered. Workshops with consultants on placement test construction have not been economically feasible. It is the desire of this DMC chairperson that work continue in this area. AMATYC members have indicated a strong interest in test construction. This committee must constantly search for ways and means to serve its constituents.

ANNUAL REPORT OF DMC SUBCOMMITTEE ON TESTING

by

Ann Dice
EMPS
Harper College
Palatine, IL 60067

Available at this year's convention is the result of several years of work by the committee....a card file of test questions from placement/diagnostic tests gathered from two-year colleges across the United States.* The questions included in the file reflect the results of the item analysis of the Atlanta test question booklet in that questions that proved to be non-discriminating are not included. Also, many corrections have been made where there were typing errors, questions repeated, no correct answer given, etc.

Many thanks to Three Rivers Community College, Poplar Bluff, Missouri, for taking charge of the last step of actually setting up the card file; it was a very time-consuming job.

Another undertaking of the committee in 1978-79 was to make an item analysis on the first 200 questions of the 600 questions collected in addition to the Atlanta booklet. We need more results before any conclusions can be made. If you, the reader, wish to help us in continuing our project by testing your students with 50 of the 200 questions, please contact me.

*The card file of test questions is available for $10.00 from the above address. Postage charges will be added to the price of $10.00.

TEACHER QUALIFICATIONS

The five-year goal of this committee is the establishment of recommended qualifications for two-year college teachers of DMC. Objectives were listed as:

1. Establish present qualifications set up by states and/or universities training two-year college faculty.

2. Determine two-year college established qualifications for DMC teachers at AMATYC member institutions.

3. Arrange debates on the necessary qualifications of DMC teachers.

4. Establish AMATYC recommended qualifications for DMC teachers and publicize.

During the 1978 school year, this subcommittee developed and distributed two questionnaires, one relating to the existing requirements for employment of developmental teachers in two-year colleges, and the other relating to teacher training in the colleges and universities of the United States. A copy of the surveys and their analyses is on file with ERIC Clearing House of Junior Colleges.

The indications from the survey were:

1. The majority of schools responding have some form of developmental mathematics curriculum, primarily under the supervision of the mathematics department.

2. Qualifications preferred and required differed in 68% of the returns, with 79% preferring a masters in mathematics. Teaching experience was preferred, but no difference was indicated in requirements for DMC teachers and mathematics instructors in general.

3. Few colleges and universities offer special programs for Developmental Mathematics Instructors, but would be interested in the results of the survey.

In reviewing the objectives listed above, it is evident that the first two objectives have been accomplished. This years report of activities indicate that progress is being made on the last two objectives.

ANNUAL REPORT OF DMC SUBCOMMITTEE ON TEACHER QUALIFICATIONS

by

Patricia Dyer
Broward Community College
Pompano Beach, Florida

For the 1978-79 academic year, this subcommittee planned activities to help complete some of the subcommittee's five-year goals. These plans were to follow up the 1977-78 national survey of qualifications for TYC teachers of DMC by....

1. Working on a local basis to determine the required and recommended qualifications (as above). Subcommittee members were to work through discussion groups in TYC departments involved in teaching the Developmental Mathematics Curriculum, in local meetings, and in state meets, and through local questionnaires. Then summaries of the activities and results were to be submitted for the 1979 annual meeting and report.

2. Planning for and holding a panel/discussion group/hearing at the national meeting in October, 1979 to secure additional input on the subject on a broader basis with the capacity for discussion and an immediate exchange of ideas and suggestions.

The subcommittee members' activities are still underway and will not be complete for the 1979 annual meeting. The discussion group/hearing is organized and features:

1. Anita Tracy, Housatonic Community College...reporting on requirements in the State of Connecticut.

2. Ron Adams, Yavapai College...reporting on the State of Arizona.

3. Donald R. Albers, Menlo College...reporting from an NSF study on DMC related aspects.

4. Leonard Feldman, San Jose State University...Mathematics Anxiety, DMC and teacher qualifications.

This will be moderated by Patricia Dyer, 1977-79 subcommittee chairperson.

This subcommittee will continue with the local activities and plan to present a preliminary statement of recommendation to the AMATYC membership at the annual meeting, Washington, D. C., 1980.

MINIMAL COMPETENCY

The five-year goal of this committee was the establishment of recommended minimal competency levels in mathematics at the two-year colleges. Objectives were listed as:

1. Perform survey to establish present competency levels of mathematics in terms of content area and difficulty level.
2. Investigate other organizations to check out their work in this area.
3. Make colleges and faculties aware of present mathematics requirements at various institutions.
4. Conduct a series of debates on standards, inviting people from many different fields, not just mathematics.
5. Develop a recommended policy of minimal standards and publicize it.

During the 1977-78 academic year, a survey to analyze minimal competency in mathematics for two-year college graduates was conducted. Results of this survey are on file with ERIC Clearing House of Junior Colleges. This sub-committee is working with three major categories of students needing mathematics skills:

a. Liberal Arts
b. Vocational and Technical
c. Science, Engineering and Mathematics

Of major interest to this committee was the fact that 156 of the 207 respondents to the survey indicated they had no minimal competency requirement but 177 of the 207 felt that the requirement should exist. In view of this, the committee's goal of having exam versions finalized by 1989 appear to be justified.

The report for the current year's activities was not received from the sub-committee chairperson in time to be included with this annual report.

LIAISON

The five-year goal of this committee was the establishment of closer cooperation and communications between AMATYC Developmental Mathematics Curriculum committee and local organizations with a similar interest. Objectives were listed as:

1. Write AMATYC delegates to establish a list of respected organizations in each state that are concerned with DMC.
2. Contact each organization to find out the extent of their DMC activity.
3. Inform these organizations of AMATYC-DMC committee activity and purpose.
4. Suggest membership in AMATYC.
5. Arrange an individual liaison member to attend meetings and maintain regular contact.

During the past three years several attempts have been made to have an effective sub-committee on Liaison. There did not seem to be the interest in the liaison committee per se.

The organization felt confident that the new committee chairperson selected in Houston at the national convention in 1978 would generate the interest, perform the duties of the chairperson, and furnish the DMC committee with an informative report in San Diego in 1979. The report follows, and her recommendation will be voted on in committee meeting.

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE LIAISON SUBCOMMITTEE

by

Karen Sharp
C. S. Mott Community College
Flint, Michigan

The purpose of this subcommittee has been to contact local organizations which are closely associated with or have similar concerns with developmental mathematics as does the DMC committee of AMATYC. We have been attempting to establish a dialogue about problems, concerns, programs and ideas in the area of Developmental or Remedial Mathematics which could be of interest and great value to both organizations.

I was appointed as chairperson of this subcommittee in late November. Since that time, I have written to all the Vice-Presidents of AMATYC and the other officers. I have also written to as many state delegates as I have been able to acquire addresses for. My letters have attempted to obtain the names and addresses of local organizations addressing themselves to Developmental Mathematics. A form* seeking information from such groups was also included in the Spring 1979 issues of the AMATYC Newsletter.

AMATYC appears to be the forerunner of any organized, concerted effort by organizations to study DMC and make policy statements regarding this subject. I did receive replies to my survey....notably from the Rocky Mountain Mathematics Consortium, California Mathematics Council of Community Colleges, MATYCNJ, and MATYCONN. I also wrote to several other groups whose names were supplied to me. However, I received no reply.

From the groups that did respond, all but one meet once per year. It appears that they all sponsor workshops and talks on Devleopmental Mathematics, but do not make policy recommendations on how Developmental Studeis should be taught or administered. The organizations have performed no formal studies of DMC. The conclusion to be drawn from these replies is that these groups are operating under no firm policy with regard to DMC. Most of the policies appear to be made at the local level by individual colleges with little or no coordination by the organized mathematics groups.

I, therefore, reluctantly conclude that AMATYC's DMC Committee is unique. I recommend that the Liaison Subcommittee be dissolved as any effective sharing of policies or studies of DMC is not possible given the structure and commitment of effort of these other organizations.

* A copy of this form is included with this annual report.

Your Name_____ Date_____

Your College Address_____

Name of Your Organization_____

Larger Organization with which your organization is affiliated:

_____

1. How many members do you have interested in Developmental Mathematics?_____

2. What percent of your members come from the type of institutions indicated below?

   two-year college____four-year college____high school____

   other____

3. How often does your group meet throughout the year?_____

4. Does your group sponsor talks, workshops, etc. on Developmental Studies? If Yes, could you describe some of these activities?

5. Has your group made any policy recommendations on how Developmental Studies should be taught, administered, etc? If Yes, could you state them here?

6. Has your group performed any formal studies on Developmental Mathematics? If Yes, please explain them.

7. If the members of your group would be interested in receiving the AMATYC DMC newsletter, then please attach a copy of their names. In addition, if you would like to advertise your group's activities in the newsletter, you can forward them to me and I will see that the information is passed along to the editors of the newsletter.

8. Would you like to be added to our mailing list?_____

9. Are you or would your group be interested in membership information regarding AMATYC?

RETURN TO: Professor Karen Sharp, Science and Math Division, C.S. Mott CC., Flint, MI 48503

EVALUATION MODEL

The five-year goal for this committee was the development of a practical guide for performing evaluations of DMC at many different colleges. The objectives were:

1. Improve the evaluation form developed by the DMC committee at an earlier date.
2. Institute a pilot program with select schools and collect data.
3. Analyze and tally the resulting data.
4. Increase the number of participating schools and repeat the data-collecting procedure.
5. Begin the development of specific workable guidelines for DMC programs and specific evaluation procedures.

Efforts were made to institute a pilot program using the evaluation form of previous years. These efforts were unproductive ....the pilot program was evidentally not geared to enough schools. With a new sub-committee chairperson for the 1978-79 academic year, much progress has been made.

This committee should address itself to a new set of objectives for the ensuing years.

ANNUAL REPORT OF EVALUATION MODEL SUB-COMMITTEE

by

Matt Hassett
Department of Mathematics
Arizona State University
Tempe, AZ 85281

The evaluation model subcommittee's four basic evaluation areas are:

1. Student performance as measured by standardized test scores, completion rates, follow-up success, etc.
2. Student evaluation as measured by attitude questionnaires.
3. Faculty evaluation of developmental programs.
4. Administrative evaluation by deans and chairmen in schools with developmental programs.

The subcommittee's work to date has been primarily in the area of performance evaluation. Thirty schools have expressed interest in gathering pre-post gain data for the MAA placement tests, and eleven schools have already submitted such data for the summer of 1979. A study of completion rates and follow-up success rates is also in progress.

Preliminary results from the summer of 1979 have shown that some problems exist which must be resolved by the subcommittee. These problems can be best understood by a look at preliminary results from eleven schools. (These results are not complete; data is still being mailed in to us from other schools.)

The results from the table (see next page) and teacher comments submitted to us indicate some of the many problems to be solved before a viable pre-post gain evaluation policy can be established.

MEAN PRETEST FOR:

MAA* TEST	COURSE	ALL STUDENTS REGISTERED	ALL STUDENTS REACHING POST-TEST	MEAN POST-TEST	MEAN GAIN	PERCENT OF ALL REGISTRANTS REACHING POST-TEST
SK/1		9.35	8.93	13.69	4.76	71
SK/1	Arithmetic	9.56	10.00	14.40	4.40	74
SK/1		10.65	10.65	14.65	4.00	100
SK/1		15.20	21.00	22.35	1.35	20
SK/1	Beginning	14.73	17.33	17.17	-0.16	55
SK/1	Algebra	8.78	11.64	14.45	2.81	61
SK/1		13.18	14.36	14.55	0.18	67
BA/1		9.45	10.80	18.0	7.20	42
BA/1	Intermediate .	6.95	8.70	10.6	1.90	45
BA/1	Algebra	12.10	14.33	21.5	7.17	60
BA/1		11.60	11.82	16.88	5.06	90

*Each test contains 25 items)

Some of these problems are:

1. Some instructors complained that the MAA tests did not cover in detail what they had taught. This was a special problem for teachers in courses titled "Beginning (Introductory) Algebra". The gain scores for such courses bear out this criticism. AMATYC may need to design its own tests.

2. Completion rates vary greatly from school to school. AMATYC needs to devise a policy under which pre-post gains are meaningful only <u>after</u> completion rate is taken into account.

3. Some schools have special problems with skill deficiencies in entering students. For example, the second school listed under Intermediate Algebra has serious problems with entering students which must be taken into account in evaluating the final gain score.

4. Instructors were told to announce to their students that the post-test was part of the final exam. However, some instructors observed that their students realized that the post-test was not really a substantial factor in the final grade and consequently rushed through it. This would invalidate many post-test scores. Further strategies must be devised to assure that the post-test is taken seriously.

Aside from the pre-post gain study, there has been a moderate amount of activity in the area of student evaluations. Committee members submitted seven such forms for our consideration. The areas of faculty and administrative forms have excited the least interest....only two forms have been submitted in each area.

Our work in each of the four major areas under consideration has shown that much future work is required. None of the questionnaires submitted to us have been accompanied by evidence of validity or reliability; most were primarily for local use at one school and thus were not nationally normed. The MAA tests have been analyzed on a national level, but some AMATYC members have questions about the face validity of those tests.

Although we have taken reasonable initial steps in the area of evaluation, it is clear that we will not be able to present a creditable evaluation model without intensive work on two basic tasks. The first task is to establish a clear and concrete set of goals for future work by the subcommittee in the light of our experience to date. For example, we need to decide whether to continue to use standardized tests (which do not satisfy all AMATYC members) or to design our own tests. Since AMATYC is helping to sponsor a conference on evaluation to be held at the Air Force Academy in March 1980, work on this first task can be begun at San Diego and carefully completed at the March conference.

The second task is to reach our goals in a professional manner which will cause our evaluation model to be widely accepted. For example, our tests and forms should be carefully tested for reliability and validity, and nationally normed. We are attempting to obtain grant money so that full time professional help can be hired to perform this second task and travel money can be alloted to allow AMATYC members detailed input into this work.

NEWSLETTER FOR DMC

The five-year goal is to publish, in conjunction with the AMATYC newsletter all DMC committee news. This will be distributed three times a year with the MATYC JOURNAL. The objectives were listed as:

1. Maintain up-to-date lists of DMC members.
2. Report DMC sub-committee work.
3. Publish DMC chairpersons' reports.
4. State possible new innovative projects that a school might have developed.
5. Report any upcoming events of the DMC committee.
6. Allow for short dialogue (paragraph type) between educators to allow an exchange of views.

The year of 1979 has been an exciting year for AMATYC. The organization is no longer associated with the MATYC JOURNAL, for AMATYC approved having its own national publication. To quote our president, "divorcing our association from the MATYC JOURNAL....was a very painful decision."

Therefore, all newsworthy items of the DMC committee will be published by the Two-Year College Math Review. The DMC committee is fortunate that the editor of our DMC newsletter has been selected to be the editor of the national publication.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES
96 POWELL LIBRARY BUILDING
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90024
EDO 56

JAN 11 1980